


KOINONIA



The Journal of the Anglican & EastLern Churches Association

Cover Illustration:
Interior, St Saviour's Church, Chora, Turkey

New Series No. 60, All Saintside 2012
ISSN No. 0012-8732

THE ANGLICAN & EASTERN
CHURCHES ASSOCIATION

Founded 1864

Orthodox Patron: The Ecumenical Patriarch

Anglican Patron: The Archbishop of Canterbury

Orthodox President: The Archbishop of Thyateira and Great Britain

Anglican President: The Bishop of London

Chairman of the Committee

The Revd Dr William Taylor

St John's Vicarage

25 Ladbroke Road

London W11 3pd

Tel: 020 7727 4262

email: vicar@stjohnsnottinghill.com

General Secretary

Janet Laws

The Bishop of London's Office

The Old Deanery

Dean's Court

London EC4V 5aa

Tel. 020 7248 6233

email: janet.laws@btopenworld.com

Treasurer

Mr David Powell

32 Westminster Palace Gardens

Artillery Row

London SW1P 1RR

Tel. 020 7222 3604

email: dp@dpcca.co.uk

Koinonia

THE JOURNAL OF THE ANGLICAN &
EASTERN CHURCHES ASSOCIATION

Editorial

IT IS a pleasure and an honour to take on the role of Editor of this journal which continues an important and longstanding tradition of dialogue and discussion between Eastern and Western Christians through the medium of a regular publication of the AECA.

In recent months, and in particular since the last issue, Eastern Christians have been brought to the attention of the West for a whole host of reasons. There was the controversy surrounding the actions of the band 'Pussy Riot' in the Cathedral of Christ the Saviour in Moscow, and the response of the Russian Orthodox Church. In Egypt, Coptic Christians were already in the news because of the continuing instability after the uprising there, but in addition there has been the death of Pope Shenouda III, and much of the western media was fascinated by the process of electing his successor. We congratulate the Coptic Church on the election of Pope Tawadros II. We must not forget the people of Syria who continue to live in fear of the terrible conflict around them, with Christians particularly vulnerable and uncertain as to what the political future of the country holds for them. And the economic situation in Greece has brought into prominence the charitable and social role of the Greek Orthodox Church. With Eastern Christianity so much in the public eye every means of furthering and deepening understanding becomes more important. It is my earnest hope and wish that Koinonia will befit its name and contribute to this cause.

This Edition of Koinonia coincides with the Annual Constantinople lecture delivered by His Grace Vahan Hovhannessian, Primate of the Armenian Orthodox Church in Great Britain and Ireland, and includes the full text of his lecture. I am grateful to him for providing it ahead of time. It is a long article, but a fascinating topic that rewards careful attention. Andrei Petrine has written a thoughtful reflection on the recent AECA pilgrimage to Russia and this edition also includes details of two AECA pilgrimages in 2013 to Sinai and Jordan and to Istanbul and the Aegean Coast. Continuing the pilgrimage theme Jonathan Collis begins what will be a series of country guides by different contributors with practical information about travel in eastern lands. Hopefully this will help and encourage members and readers to visit these places and perhaps take groups, thereby contributing to greater understanding between Eastern and Western Christians. Book reviews have also been kindly contributed by Hugh Wybrew and William Taylor.

I am grateful to all the contributors who have provided material for this edition. It is my aim to provide a mix of news, articles and reviews that reflects the varied interests and scholarship of the membership and which will challenge, stimulate and provoke discussion. But I am most grateful to Peter Doll who first introduced me to Koinonia and the AECA, and will endeavour to maintain the high standards which he firmly established in his time as Editor and which the Association deserves so that its stated mission may be furthered:

To advance the Christian religion, particularly by teaching members of the Anglican and Orthodox Churches about each other, in order to prepare the way for an ultimate union between them, in accordance with our Lord's prayer that "all may be one". All its members are urged to work and pray constantly to this end.

Contents

The New Testament Apocrypha and The Armenian Church Canon of the Bible.....	6
AECA Pilgrimage to Holy Russia: A Reflection.....	38
Eastern Travel Guides: Taking a group to Istanbul	45
Book Reviews	47

Contributors

VAHAN HOVHANNESIAN is Primate of the Armenian Orthodox Church in Great Britain and Ireland and is a leading academic in the field of Biblical studies, the New Testament Apocrypha and Early Christianity. He is the 2012 Constantinople lecturer.

ANDREI PETRINE is Priest-in-Charge of the United Benefice of Greensted Juxta Ongar with Stanford Rivers & Stapleford Tawney with Theydon Mount in the diocese of Chelmsford. He is also Chaplain to the Russian speaking community in London and Pilgrimage Secretary of AECA.

JONATHAN COLLIS is Vicar of Southend-on-Sea, and a member of the AECA committee.

HUGH WYBREW is a retired Anglican priest living in Oxford. Formerly Dean of St George's Anglican Cathedral in Jerusalem he is a director of the Jerusalem and Middle East Church Association.

WILLIAM TAYLOR is the Chairman of AECA and Vicar of St John's, Notting Hill in London. He is also the Ecumenical Advisor for the Kensington Episcopal Area.

News and Notices

Lecture on Syrian Christianity

The AECA in conjunction with the Fellowship of St Alban and St Sergius invites you to the lecture by Dr Mikael Oz entitled 'The Conflict in Syria and its effect upon the Christian community' at St James', Sussex Gardens on 5th February 2013 at 7.15pm. See the notice on p. 52 for further details.

2013 AECA Pilgrimages

In 2013 there will be two pilgrimages organised by AECA:

- *Sinai and Jordan.* 20-30 May with Bishop Edward Holland, Assistant Bishop in the Diocese of London. Includes St Catharine's Monastery, Sinai and the ancient rock city of Petra and many Biblical sites.
- *Istanbul and the Aegean Coast.* 2-10 October with Trevor Willmott, Bishop of Dover. A pilgrimage to some of the Seven Churches of Revelation complemented with three nights in Istanbul and a visit to Gallipoli and Troy.

For a detailed brochure with full itinerary and information about costs, practicalities and how to book, please contact the Pilgrimage Secretary, the Revd Andrei Petrine using the details on the inside back cover.

The Philip Usher Fund

This Fund exists to promote the study of any aspect of Orthodoxy in situ by Anglican ordinands. Set up in memory of The Rev'd Philip Usher, who was killed on active service in Second World War, the Fund has sponsored generations of Anglican ordinands in acquiring a better

knowledge of Orthodoxy, generally in a majority Orthodox environment. The Fund is actively trying to disseminate wider knowledge of its existence, and a website is soon to be created. In the meantime, Anglican ordinands who wish to learn more about the Fund or make an application should apply to the Administrative Secretary, Janet Laws, at janet.laws@btopenworld.com, or c/o The Old Deanery, Dean's Court, London EC4V 5AA. Longer, rather than shorter, periods of study are preferred.

The New Testament Apocrypha and The Armenian Church Canon of the Bible

VAHAN HOVHANESSIAN

I. Introduction.

IT IS NECESSARY, as we start our exploration of the Armenian version of the Bible this evening, to elaborate on certain key definitions, taking into consideration the complex make-up of the targeted audience of this lecture.

- Bible: from the plural of a Greek word meaning “book.” The word “Bible” therefore means “books” or “a collection of books.”
- *Asdvadzashoonch* - “inspired by God”: This is the Armenian word for the Bible, which comes from St. Paul’s statement in 2 Tim 3:16 where he states that all writings are inspired by God (θεόπνευστος).
- Biblical Canon or Canon of Scripture: is the collection or list of books considered to be divinely inspired and authoritative by a particular religious community. The word “canon” comes from the Greek “κανών”, meaning “rule” or “measuring rod.”
- Apocrypha: from the Greek word (ἀπόκρυφα) meaning “things hidden away”. This term is used in biblical studies to refer to a group of books which are found in the canon of the Bible of certain religious groups but not in the others. Through the centuries the word had various other connotations.
- Pseudepigrapha: from a Greek word meaning “false superscription,” or “false title.” The word is used to referring to writings whose real authors attributed them to well-known or popular figures of the past.
- Septuagint: is a Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament, which was launched in the late 3rd century BC. Several translations of the Old Testament during the early centuries of Christianity were based on this version and not the Hebrew manuscripts. The Apostle

Paul and early Church Fathers used this version of the Old Testament as well. It is usually referred to as “LXX.”

II. The Armenian Translation of the Bible

The light of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ enlightened the land of the Armenians when two of His apostles Thaddeus and Bartholomew preached, witnessed and ministered there. However, it was not until almost three centuries later, in 301 AD, that a Parthian man by the name of Gregory succeeded in converting the king of Armenia, Tiridates, to Christianity. The King’s adoption of Christianity triggered a ripple effect, causing the conversion of the Armenian princes, army generals and the entire kingdom, thus affording Gregory the title “Enlightener of Armenia” and making Armenia the first kingdom in the world to adopt Christianity as its state-religion in AD 301 (twelve years before the issuing of the Edict of Milan by emperors Constantine the First and Licinius, which proclaimed religious freedom and tolerance of Christianity in the Roman Empire).

Despite the conversion of the King to Christianity and the adoption of this life-giving faith in the land of the Armenians, the Bible remained unavailable to Armenians in their native language. This was so for the very basic reason that Armenians did not have their own alphabet in order to put their spoken language in writing. According to Fifth-century Armenian historians, Koriwn, Łazar Parpetsi and Moses Khorenatsi, Armenians through the centuries used the Greek, Syriac and Pahlavi Persian scripts for their court documents and official correspondence. Following Armenia’s conversion to Christianity, the Bible was read, preached and taught in some cities and villages in Armenia in the Greek language and in others in Syriac, depending on where Christian missionaries in these regions were trained and educated.

Łazar Parpetsi, for example, comments on church leaders being “concerned and distressed, seeing the great effort and even the more expenditures of the children of the land of Armenia, who at great cost

and with long journeys and extensive study passed their days in schools of Syrian education. For church services and readings of Scriptures were conducted in Syriac in the monasteries and churches of the people of Armenia. ... and the incomprehension of the Syrian language caused toil to the ministers and was unprofitable to the people.”¹

During the early years of the fifth century a learned monk by the name of Mashtots, succeeded in gaining the support of the Patriarch of the time, Catholicos Sahak (Isaac), and the king of Armenia, Vramshapouh, to funding his research efforts for inventing an Armenian alphabet. By 406, Mashtots had succeeded in inventing an alphabet which matched the unique sounds in the Armenian language. With the invention of the Alphabet, the era of Armenian literature began, and within less than a century lead to the Golden Age of Armenian literature. It should be noted that the alphabet invented by Mashtots is practically the same one used until today by Armenians around the world.

Immediately following the invention of the alphabet, the Catholicos and St. Mashtots prepared teams of translators to pursue the translation of the Bible into Armenian. Catholicos Sahak, according to the 5th-Century Church historian Moses Khorenatsi, made a translation of the Bible from the Syriac text about 411 AD, which is referred to as the hastily-translated version. This version bears clear evidence of the influence of the Syriac language on the Armenian text. Scholars usually refer to this version of the Armenian translation as *Armi*. Soon afterwards two of the disciples of St. Mashtots, John of Egheghiatz and Joseph of Baghin, were sent to Edessa to perfect the translation of the Armenian Scriptures. They brought back with them authentic copies of the Greek text of the Bible from Constantinople. With the help of other copies obtained from Alexandria the Bible was translated again, this time from the Greek, using the text of the Septuagint and Origen's Hexapla. This version was completed about 434 AD and is usually referred to as *Arme2*, which is the version found in the majority of the Armenian manuscripts

of the Bible. It should also be noted that today some books of the Bible survive in two revisions in the Armenian manuscripts. This clearly indicates the two stages of the initial translation mentioned above.

The Armenian manuscripts of the Bible available to us today indicate the complexity of the parent text from which the Armenian Bible was translated. Scholars have demonstrated clear evidence of the presence of Origen's hexaplaric signs in the Armenian manuscripts of the Old Testament, thus confirming the influence of Origen's version on the Armenian translation of the Bible. Similarly Armenian scribes have preserved words and phrases from the Bible versions of Aquila, Symachus and Theodotion, which are usually found in the margins of the Armenian manuscripts. Certain books in the Old Testament, such as Ruth, 1-2 Kings and Daniel bear clear evidence of the influence of the version of Septuagint revised by Lucian of Antioch.

The situation of the text of the Armenian New Testament is as complicated as that for the Old Testament. Scholars have demonstrated clear connection with Caesarea, an important centre of Christianity. Several recent studies of the Armenian text of the New Testament point in the direction of Syriac as the parent text. Needless to say, the complex body of Biblical versions that served as the parent texts for the translation of the Bible into Armenian, had their influence on defining the canonical lists of the books included in the Bible.

Through the centuries, the Armenian translation of the Bible went through several revisions. One of the important revisions is the one done within a century or so following the completion of its initial translation, which was done to make the Armenian version of the Bible agree with the Syriac Church's official translation, known as Peshitta. Among the several consequences of this revision process was the insertion into the Armenian version of the Bible of several books that were found in the Peshitta but not in the Greek or Hebrew books of the Bible. Among the latter category of books, for example, we mention "The Third Letter of St. Paul to the Corinthians" (3 Cor).

¹ Łazar P'arpec'i, *History of the Armenians* (Delmar: Caravan Books, 1985), p. 13

Despite the complexity of the parent text of the Armenian version, and the various stages of revision, the Classical Armenian version of the Bible remains one of the best earliest translations of the Bible. The French biblical scholar, M. V. La Croze of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, is justified in calling the Armenian translation of the Bible as the Queen of translations.

As indicated earlier, the Armenian Church used the Syriac version of the Bible in the liturgical services as well as teaching ministry, for centuries prior to the invention of the Armenian alphabet and the translation of the Bible into Armenian. The second and third century Syriac commentaries of the fathers of the Syrian church point to the fact that the Old Syriac New Testament included apocryphal documents.² Contemporary scholarship confirms that sufficient evidence has survived to render it certain that the Old Syriac version of the New Testament included apocryphal writings.³ Consequently, Armenians and their vardapets, prior to the translation of the Bible into Armenian, must have known of these apocryphal books, used them to preach and teach the Good News, and most importantly accepted them as part of their New Testament canon and the foundation for the rule of faith in the Armenian Church.

During the early centuries of Christianity, pseudepigraphic and pseudonymous books and letters, associated with the New Testament, circulated in Christian and non-Christian communities. Orthodox fathers of the church as well as gnostic and heretical teachers contributed to the creation and evolution of this body of literature. Some of the apocryphal documents were received by the early church and treated as authentic and genuine apostolic literature. Of the latter group, several

writings are still part of the New Testament.⁴ Other writings made it into the New Testament canon of some of the churches in certain parts of the world at various times, but were ultimately removed from the sacred collection.⁵ Finally, there is a third group of apocryphal writings that was condemned by the fathers of the church as being heretical and promoting unorthodox teachings.

Following the translation of the Bible into Armenian, some of the apocryphal writings associated with the New Testament, were translated into Armenian as early as the fifth century, as part of the Golden age translation of the Bible.⁶ Today, certain versions of some of these translated writings survive only in Armenian manuscripts.⁷ Several of these documents, such as *Third Corinthians*, henceforth *3 Cor*, and *The Repose of the Evangelist John*, or *The Rest of the Blessed John*, henceforth *RBJ*, continued to be copied as part of the Armenian New Testament, or an appendix to it, for centuries. Those writings which did not make it into the New Testament of the Armenian Church were not all necessarily condemned and destroyed. Rather, many of them continued to be copied and preserved in the Armenian Church as religious literature for catechetical purposes and for the spiritual entertainment of the faithful.

III. Armenian Apocrypha in Scholarly Literature

Not much has been published in Armenian concerning the Apocryphal Armenian literature, studying its contribution to the textual criticism of the New Testament Apocrypha and the history of its use in early Christianity. In the second half of the 19th century, the Mekhitarist fathers

⁴ Among these we mention the canonical Second Letter of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, the Apostle's Letter to the Colossians and others.

⁵ See, for example, the status of the apocryphal Apocalypse of Peter in the Muratorian fragment. F. Bruce, *The Canon of Scriptures*, (Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1988), pp. 158-169; and Geoffrey Mark Hahneman, *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992).

⁶ See the discussion concerning the dating of the Armenian version of the *Rest of the Evangelist John*, in Yovsep Gatrchean, *Hangist Eramelcoyn Yovhannu* (Vienna, 1877), pp. 6ff.

⁷ See, for example, the Armenian version of the *Rest of the Evangelist John*, and the *Gospel of Infancy*.

² See, for example, Aphraat's use of *3 Cor* in his *Demonstration IV "Of Monks"* and Joseph Kerschenscheiner "Beobachtungen zum altsyrischen Actatext," *Biblica* 45 (1964), pp. 63-74. St. Ephrem, on the other hand, dedicates a complete chapter in his commentary on the epistles of St. Paul to the apocryphal *Third Corinthians*. See, S. Ephraemi Syri commentarii in epistolae S. Pauli.

³ See Joseph Kerschenscheiner, *Der Altsyrische Paulustext*, CSCO, 315 (1970), pp. 63-74.

published a three-volume study pioneering an effort to introduce and explore the Armenian apocryphal literature as preserved in the Armenian manuscripts of their monastery in Venice, Italy. The first volume of the series, *Ankanon girê' bin ktakaranac'*, "The Non-Canonical Books of the Old Testament," by Sargis Yovsep'ianc', examines the Old Testament apocrypha preserved in the Armenian manuscripts of the Mekhitarist monastery in Venice.⁸ In second volume, titled, *Ankanon girê' nor ktakaranac'* "The Non-Canonical Books of the New Testament," published in 1898, Fr. Yesayi Dayetsi discusses the Armenian apocryphal literature associated mainly with our Lord and the Theotokos.⁹ Volume three of the same series, published six years later by Fr. Kerovpé Charikian, is dedicated to the apocryphal writings attributed to the Apostles and to the New Testament characters.¹⁰ Other than brief introductions at the beginning of each one of them, the three volumes mentioned above are basically collections of Armenian apocryphal texts as preserved in Armenian manuscripts of the Mekhitarist brotherhood in Venice. The published text of each of these apocryphal writings, therefore, is simply that of the Venice manuscripts. Other than footnote references to some textual variations among the various Venice manuscripts of the specific writing, the final two volumes of the series do not offer any discussion of the history of the association of these writings with the New Testament canon. Missing from the two volumes mentioned above are the following three interesting apocryphal writings: *3 Cor*, the *Rest of the Evangelist John*, (henceforth *REJ*), and the *Petition of Euthalius*. Fr. Charikian refers to these documents in the introduction to his volume, but does not publish their texts. He simply mentions their titles and the very few articles published earlier by other

⁸ Fr. Sargis Yovsep'ianc', *Ankanon Girê Hin Ktakaranats*, (Venice: St. Lazzaro, 1896). This volume was translated into English a few years later by J. Issaverdens, *The Uncanonical Writings of the Old Testament Found in the Armenian MSS. of the Library of St. Lazarus*, (Venice, 1934).

⁹ Fr. Esayi Tayec'i, *Ankanon Girê Nor Ktakaranats*, (Venice: St. Lazzaro, 1898).

¹⁰ The late French Armeniologist Louis Leloir translated this volume into French in his work, *Écrits apocryphes sur les Apôtres: traduction de l'édition arménienne de Venise* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1986).

members of the Mekhitarist brotherhood, who have published the Armenian texts of these three documents separately.¹¹

During the twentieth century, and since the publication of the three volumes by the Mekhitarist fathers, several Armenian and non-Armenian scholars have contributed to the study of the Armenian New Testament Apocrypha. In his published collection of essays in *Manrêker*, professor Hagop S. Anassian, of the Armenian Manuscript Library (Matenadaran) in Yerevan, offers a brief introduction to the history of the Armenian New Testament in general where several pages are dedicated to the subject of New Testament Apocrypha in Armenian. His work includes also an extensive bibliography of the various scholarly works concerning the apocryphal writings published by the date of the publication of his book.¹² Archbishop Chahé Adjemian, of the brotherhood of St. James in Jerusalem, contributes to the discussion of the Armenian New Testament Apocrypha through his work, *Grand Catalogue des manuscrits arméniennes de la bible*.¹³ In the introduction to his *Catalogue*, Abp. Adjemian designates a section discussing the issues related to the New Testament Canon in the Armenian Church.¹⁴ Within that section he mentions some of the New Testament Apocrypha that made it into the canon and refers to some of the scholarly works pertaining to them.¹⁵

The situation concerning the pursuit of scholarly research in the field of the Armenian New Testament Apocrypha is not much different

¹¹ Charikian, pp. See also Fr. Aristakes Vartanian's *Matenagrutyunkê Eul'âti* "Euthalian Literature," (Venice: St. Lazzaro, 1930), in which the author discusses the introductions to the books of the Bible attributed to Euthalius, which exist in almost all the Armenian manuscripts of the Bible. A few pages of this work are dedicated to the apocryphal "Petition of Euthalius," pp. 209-212.

¹² Edited by professor A. K. Sanchean (Los Angeles: La Verne, 1988), pp. 159-163 and 168-173.

¹³ Lisbone: Bibliothèque Arménienne de la Fondation Calouste Gulbenkian, 1992.

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. XCVII-CIII.

¹⁵ Ibid., pp. CI-CII. See also the introduction of Frederick Murad's monumental work *Hayt-nut' eam Hovhannu bin bay t'argmanut' iwnl*. (The Old Armenian Translation of the Revelation of John), (Jerusalem: St. James Press, 1911), where the author discusses several Armenian lists of the New Testament canon, which serve as a valuable resource in the study of the history of the Armenian New Testament canon and apocrypha; and Taniel Šamlean, "The Canonical and Deuterocanonical Books of the Holy Scriptures," *Sion*, (1966), pp. 83-87.

in the West. This is specially the case in the English literature. Toward the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, as part of a revitalized interest in the non-canonical books of the early Church, a small group of Bible scholars and armeniologists published several articles and a few books introducing some of the Armenian manuscripts and versions of the New Testament apocryphal texts to western scholars.¹⁶ Among the scholarly works published in the West during the second half of the previous century, we mention the articles of professor Gérard Garitte examining the apocryphal documents associated with the apostle Thomas in the Armenian tradition.¹⁷ Peter Cowe, of UCLA, has published several articles, which examine the text of 3 Cor and discuss various issues related to its canonicity.¹⁸ In a recently published volume of several articles concerning the Armenian apocrypha, the editor of the volume, Valentina Calzolari Bouvier, offers a valuable recap of the state of scholarly research in the field of Armenian Apocrypha, Old and New Testaments. The article, "En guise d'introduction: quelques réflexions sur le rôle de la littérature apocryphe dans l'Arménie chrétienne ancienne," explores also the role that this body of literature played in the early stages of Christianity in Armenia.¹⁹

¹⁶ In 1894, Paul Verter published his book *Der apokryphe dritte korintherbrief*, examining the Armenian version of Third Corinthians. See also the same author's articles, "Armenische apokryphe Apostelgeschichten," in *Akten des V. Internationalen Congress der Katholischen Gesellschaft* (1901), pp. 361ff.; "Armenische Apostelakten," *Oriens Christianus* (1901), pp. 168-170; and "Die armenischen apokryphen Apostelgeschichten," in *Theologische Quartalschrift* (1906), pp. 161-186. In 1895, Professor Joseph Armitage Robinson, Dean of Westminster, published his notes concerning the Armenian version of the New Testament, examining the apocryphal introductions to the epistles of St. Paul attributed to Euthalius, in *Euthalius* as part of the "Text and Studies" series of Cambridge University. Frederick Cornwallis Conybeare published several articles examining the Armenian version of several New Testament Apocrypha such as "Acta Pilati" in *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica* (1896), pp. 59-132 and "Protoevangelium Iacobi" in *The American Journal of Theology*, I, no. 2 (1897), pp. 424-42.

¹⁷ "Le martyre géorgien de l'apôtre Thomas," *Le Muséon*, XXXIII (1970), pp. 497-532; and "La passion arménienne de S. Thomas l'apôtre et son modèle grec," *Le Muséon*, XXXIV (1971), pp. 151-195. ¹⁸ "Christological Trends and Textual Transmission," in *Text and Context: Studies in the Armenian New Testament* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993); and "Text Critical of the Armenian Version of *Third Corinthians*," in Valentina Calzolari Bouvier's, *Apocryphe arméniens: transmission - traduction - iconographie*. (Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 1999), pp. 91-102.

¹⁹ Calzolari Bouvier, *Apocryphe arméniens*, pp. 9-18.

Almost all these publications call for a more detailed and closer examination of the various documents they introduce. At this stage one should also mention the extensive research and publications of Professor Michael Stone, of the Hebrew University, in the field of Armenian Apocrypha. Professor Stone's work, unfortunately, is limited to the field of Old Testament literature.²⁰ Meanwhile, volumes of the New Testament Apocrypha in general, published in the previous century until a few years ago mention, and only in passing, the Armenian version of these apocryphal writings. Among these reference works, we mention those by Hennecke, Schneemelcher, Charlesworth and others.²¹

IV. Armenian Apocrypha in Patristic Literature

The earliest three Armenian narrations on the translation of the Bible leave us, to say the least, uncertain regarding the canon of the New Testament and the apocryphal literature incorporated in it at the time of the initial translation. To begin with, none of the three works have preserved an exact list of the translated books of the Bible. Koriwn, whose biography of Mashdots, *Vark Mashdotsi*, is the basis of the works of the other two historians, Łazar Parpetsi (5th c.) and Moses Khorenatsi (8th c.), comments on the translation of the Bible, summarizing the contents of the newly translated Scriptures into Armenian as follows:

At that time our blessed and wonderful land of Armenia became truly worthy of admiration where by the hands of two colleagues, suddenly, in an instant, Moses, the law-giver, along with the order of the prophets,

²⁰ "The Apocryphal Literature in the Armenian Tradition," *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* 4 (1969), pp. 59-77; "Armenian Version of Bible," *Encyclopedia Judaica*. Jerusalem, 1971, pp. 5, 861-62; "Armenian Canon Lists, I: The Canon of Partaw," *Harvard Theological Review* (HTR) 67 (1973), pp. 479-486; "Armenian Canon Lists II: The Stichometry of Anania of Shirak," *HTR* 69 (1976), pp. 253-260; "Armenian Canon Lists III - The Lists of Mechar of Ayivank," *HTR* 73 (1980), pp. 237-244; "Armenian Canon Lists IV: The List of Gregory of Tathew," *HTR* 83 (1990), pp. 141-161, and others.

²¹ Edgar Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1955); James H. Charlesworth, *The New Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* (Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1987); and James Keith Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).

energetic Paul with the entire phalanx of the apostles, along with Christ's world-sustaining gospel, became Armenian-speaking.²²

Koriwn's Bible, therefore, must have included the Pentateuch, the Prophets, a Pauline corpus, writings related to the apostles, and the Gospels. Although the Book of Acts is not mentioned in the above list, we know from the contents of Koriwn's book that his Bible included the Book of Acts.²³ We also know that the Pauline corpus consisted of 14 letters including the one to the Hebrews.²⁴ However, not much is said regarding the rest of the New Testament canon including the Catholic Epistles and the titles of the fourteen letters of Pauline. The Book of Revelation, on the other hand, is definitely missing from Koriwn's list and discussions.

Somewhere else in his *History*, Koriwn makes it clear that he is aware of the existence of non-orthodox and pseudepigraphic books, circulating in Armenia. In Chapter 23, for example, he mentions a book by a certain Theodore which was burned by the order of the synodical fathers because of the false teachings it contained. Yet, at the end of chapter two, having just finished listing evidence from the various canonical books of the Bible supporting his project of publishing the biography of his master, Koriwn adds:

We have also the gracious canonic writings which came after the apostles indicating how they honored and praised one another for their true faith and evangelical life and have been similarly treated to this very day.²⁵

We know that the "writings" Koriwn is referring to are religious discourses about the apostles written after their death. Their contents "honor" the apostles by recording their acts and teachings. The insertion of this statement in the narration of Koriwn's history after having

just finished listing the books of the New Testament, indicates that Koriwn was aware of the existence of other books, written after the apostles, which were treated by the Armenians "similarly" or as canonical. Obviously, the adjective *zkanonakan*, i.e. "canonical", given to these books indicates that, unlike the one by Theodore mentioned earlier, these books were accepted by Koriwn and his church as part of the divine inspiration. The normative status of these books is further emphasized when Koriwn adds that his duty right to compose and promote his master's biography is confirmed further by the contents of these books in addition to those of the Bible which he enumerated earlier.²⁶ However, it is also obvious that for Koriwn the status of these books was different than the canonical ones he listed earlier.

Manug Apeghya, the editor of the 1940 edition of the *Varḳ* *Mashoc'i*, interprets Koriwn's statement, "canonic writings which came after the apostles" as a reference to a body of ecclesiastical literature that circulated independently of the Bible for church administration. However, Koriwn's description of the contents of these books and his reference to them as "canonic" argue for their association with, if not inclusion in, the canon of the New Testament. The fact that Koriwn is using this literature as an authoritative and normative source for writing the biography of his teacher, argues against the suggestion that these "canonic books" represent a corpus of ecclesiastical books independent of the New Testament. The existence of a separate Armenian Christian corpus, at the time of Koriwn, which contained praises of holy men and women of God would have been enough to justify Koriwn's project. He would not have needed to go through lengthy explanations to validate his work. Justifications for this kind of a literature is an indication that no such writings were known to Koriwn and to his contemporaries out-

²² *Koriwn*, translated by Bedros Norehad, (New York: Caravan Books, 1985), p. 34.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

²⁴ *Koriwn*, pp 26 and 32.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

²⁶ Almost one sixth of Koriwn's book is dedicated to justifying the writing of a holy man's biography. In the introduction to his work, Koriwn rhetorically asks the question "whether it is permissible to write concerning the lives of deceased men." After references to various passages in the Bible he concludes that it is permissible to do so. See, *Koriwn*, p. xiv.

side what was considered the inspired or canonical books of the Scriptures.

Furthermore, the three historians mentioned earlier state that the campaign to translate the Bible into Armenian, which ultimately led to the Golden-age of Armenian literature, incorporated also the translation of many patristic commentaries and writings. There is no doubt that the fathers of the Armenian Church received these commentaries as orthodox and essential in teaching and promoting the Christian faith. Among them, and of interest to our subject this evening, we mention St. Ephraem's Commentary on the Bible and St. Aphraates theological discourses. The fact that the earlier includes a chapter dedicated to comments on the apocryphal 3 Cor, and the latter includes several quotations from 3 Cor as genuine sayings of the apostle Paul, supports the argument that the Armenian New Testament of the 5th century must have included 3 Cor, or given it a semi-canonical status.

In his version of the *History of the Armenians*, Moses Khorenatsi, who had at his exposure the earlier Armenian sources, does not add much to what had already been said regarding the canon of the New Testament. However, it is worth commenting on an interesting reference he makes. In the Third Book of his work *History of the Armenians*, Khorenatsi adds:

Then straightaway he set translating wisely beginning with Proverbs. Completing the twenty-two known books, he translated also the New Testament into Armenian.

The "twenty-two known books" is an obvious reference to the Hebrew canon of the Old Testament. While nothing is mentioned regarding the list of the books of the New Testament, the word "known" or "revealed" from the classical Armenian *yaytni*, applied to the twenty-two books of the Old Testament, assumes that *Khorenatsi* was aware of the development of a body of literature known as the canonical writings versus the Apocrypha, "hidden" or "unrevealed." One may ask, however, why would Khorenatsi mention the number of the Old Testament

books but not that of the New Testament? By the time he was editing his version of the *History*, the churches in the East and West had already developed, finalized and closed their canon of the New Testament. It would have been very difficult for him, therefore, to include certain locally popular books such as 3 Cor in the canon when influential fathers of the church as well as centers of Christianity had, by then, defined the canon excluding these books. On the other hand, it is equally difficult for him to exclude and condemn books that have been used by renowned *vardapets* of the church in the East such as Sts. Gregory the Illuminator, Ephraem and Aphraat. This must have created some kind of a tension in the Armenian Church between the popular tradition regarding the canon versus the ecclesiastically recognized list of the canonical book. We will trace expressions and consequences of this tension in the following sections of this presentation.

Early Armenian commentators of the Bible treated a few of the New Testament apocrypha as canonical and genuine Apostolic writings. The early fifth century father of the Armenian Church Eznik Kořbac'i, a disciple of St. Mesrob Mashtotz and one of the translators of the Bible into Armenian, for example, treats 3 Cor as a genuine letter of the apostle Paul and as part of the divinely inspired scriptures. In his book, *A Treatise On God*, arguing for the almightiness of God, Kořbac'i uses St. Paul's authority to reinforce his teaching. Quoting from 3 Cor, Kořbac'i says, "And why would the Apostle say, 'Satan too will become subject to our savior together with death, and he will fall from his principality and from his dominion, he who wanted to become God by himself'?"²⁷ The latter is, obviously, a quotation from 3 Cor 11-17. This fifth century holy translator, therefore, must have accepted the apocryphal 3 Cor as a genuine and canonical book of the New Testament.

Theodore von Zahn in his *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons* mentions in passing three references to 3 Cor in the late fifth century,

²⁷ See section 264 in Monica J. Blanchard and Robin Darling Young's *Eznik of Koth - On God* (Leuven: Peeters, 1998), p. 147.

History of the Armenians by Agathangelos.²⁸ The first reference is from the mouth of St. Gregory the Illuminator in the section of the book entitled "Teachings of St. Gregory." In chapter 25, section 280, 3 Cor 2:11 is quoted as a direct saying of the apostle Paul. In section 387 of chapter 41 of the Teachings, St. Gregory quotes 3 Cor 2:13-16 as a divine revelation. Finally, section 179 of chapter 16, which is the text of a prayer by St. Hripsimé, includes a reference to 3 Cor 2:30. There is no doubt, therefore, that the New Testament of Agathangelos, and possibly that of St. Gregory and St. Hripsimé included the apocryphal 3 Cor.

By the seventh century, we find enough evidence in the patristic literature pointing to the disagreement between the ecclesiastical list of the canonical books of the New Testament books and the popular non-canonical New Testament Apocrypha. Yovhannēs Mayragomec'i, for example, argues against the inclusion of verses 43-44 of chapter 22 of the Gospel of Luke in the canonical text and rejects them as "non-canonical." Arguing against Mayragomec'i, and defending the divine inspiration of these verses as well as of 3 Cor, the 7th century saint of the Armenian Church, T'ēodoros K'it'enavor, reaffirms the authenticity of 3 Cor and its Apostolic origin. He argues that the verses mentioned above, as well as 3 Cor, were part of the Armenian New Testament since the time of St. Gregory, quoting Agathangelos's reference to 3 Cor in St. Gregory's speech. K'it'enavor, on the other hand, admits that recent copies of the New Testament do not include these apocryphal texts anymore.

Rebottling Mayragomec'i's argument, therefore, K'it'enavor states,

When our forefathers the Christ-bearing orthodox bishops assembled in the city of Nicaea, they established a canon that only fourteen epistles of the divinely preaching apostle Paul should be read in the holy convocation, and in the modern version of scriptures this arrangement

is adopted. However what the fathers pass over in silence, and is not included in the new translation, is cited in the homilies of the acclaimed Gregory. ... So then if the older gospel is to be rejected and discarded by the church as inauthentic because that passage is not transcribed by the more recently produced translation, by the same token the great primate Gregory is disdained and slandered.²⁹

Thus, while K'it'enavor admits that by his time these apocryphal books or added verses were no longer copied as part of the scriptures, they were, K'it'enavor insists, revered by the Armenians as part of the divine revelation. Since these books did not make it in the canonical lists developed by the churches, known to Mayragomec'i and K'it'enavor, they were removed from the new versions of the Armenian books of the New Testament. Despite that, it is obvious from K'it'enavor's comment that the Armenian Church continued treating these writings as part of the divine revelation and continued preaching and teaching from them. K'it'enavor's comments shed light on very important dynamics in the New Testament canon of the Armenian Church, a dynamic that was created and perpetuated by the lack of a decision by an Armenian Church council defining the list of the canonical books,³⁰ and by centuries of reverence and popular interest in the New Testament Apocrypha. These dynamics, I believe, ultimately prevented the official and ecclesiastical closing of the canon. How could have any Armenian bishop or Patriarch condemned a writing, such as 3 Cor, when the same was used by St. Gregory and treated as part of the divine revelation?

Despite this ongoing tension, many Armenian fathers of the church continued using and referring to certain apocryphal documents as divinely inspired literature and, in some cases, as part of the canon of

²⁹ S. P. Cowe, "Christological Trends and Textual Transmission," in *Text and Context: Studies in the Armenian New Testament* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), p. 42.

³⁰ The only Armenian Church council that includes a canon dealing with the list of the canonical books of the Bible is the Council of Partaw (AD 768). However, this council's list includes the books of the Old Testament only. Scholars agree that this canon is a translation of an earlier non-Armenian text that was later inserted into the collection of the Partaw canons. See Garegin Zarthanalian, *Matenadaran haykakan t'argmanut' eanc' naxneac'*, (Venice: St. Lazzaro, 1889), p. 225.

²⁸ For a detailed study of these and other Armenian patristic references to 3 Cor, see the author's book, *Third Corinthians: Reclaiming Paul for Christian Orthodoxy* (New York: Peter Lang, 2000), pp.

the Bible. Nersess Lambronac'i, one of the famous theologians of the Cilician Era of the Armenian Church, has many commentaries on the various books of the Old and New Testaments including the 12 minor prophets and book of Psalms. Of interest to us are manuscripts #1587, 3196, 3649 and several others in the Jerusalem collection of manuscripts which include Lambronac'i's commentary on the *Rest of the Evangelist John* (REJ).³¹ Obviously, since the collection includes the saint's commentary of the biblical books, one can safely conclude that Lambronac'i's New Testament included REJ. In a few of the manuscripts, such as in #3649 of the St. James collection, we find the following subtitle, *meknut'iven m-jman yovhannu greal i xntroy step'anos yovkatsvroy ivroy vardapeti*.³² "Commentary on the Rest of John written by the request of Stepanos Hagovgatsi his teacher." This means that the apocryphal REJ was not only part of Lambronac'i's canon of the New Testament, but also of his vardapet and teacher, Step'anos Hagovgac'i. This makes the apocryphal REJ part of the canon of the Armenian New Testament at least in the Cilician Armenia some time toward the end of the 11th century. Lambronac'i's New Testament included 3 Cor as well. A manuscript in the St. James Collection in Jerusalem preserves a homily by the saint, where he uses the same verses of 3 Cor mentioned in Agathangelos and introduces them as genuine teachings of the apostles.³³

The New Testament of Anania Sanahnec'i, another 11th century vardapet of the Armenian Church and a son of the Sanahin Monastery, included apocryphal writings also.³⁴ Copies of his commentaries on the Letters of Paul are preserved in manuscripts #234, 254, 260 and 523 of

the St. James collection in Jerusalem.³⁵ Among his comments on the letters of St. Paul in these manuscripts we find a section dedicated to the apocryphal 3 Cor. This section comes immediately after his comments on 2 Cor and before those on Galatians. This confirms not only that 3 Cor was part of the New Testament canon during Sanahnec'i's time, but also, by virtue of its location after 2 Cor and before Galatians, that it was treated as an authentic and canonical writing. In fact a few of the manuscripts indicate that Sanahnec'i's commentary on Paul's letters, including 3 Cor, was written by the request of Catholicos Petros Getadarc'.³⁶ This will take the commentary back to the late 10th and early 11th centuries.³⁷

Yovhanēs Orotneç'i, a fourteenth century chief vardapet of the Armenian Church, and a mentor to many theologians at the monasteries of Glaj'or and Tat'ew, including Grigor Tat'ewac'i, the Vardapet *par excellence* of the Armenian Church, not only accepted 3 Cor as a genuine Pauline letter, but as part of the canon of the New Testament as well. His comments on the epistles of St. Paul, including 3 Cor, exist in several manuscripts which contain collections of commentaries on the various books of the Bible.³⁸ For a vardapet of such a renowned fame and theological authority to write a commentary on 3 Cor, clearly indicates that the apocryphal was accepted also by the communities and monastic hierarchies of Glaj'or and Tat'ew.

It should not be a surprise, therefore, to find another commentary on 3 Cor by Orotneç'i's student, Grigor Tat'ewac'i. Manuscripts #279 and 477 of St. James collection in Jerusalem include Tadevatsi's commentary on 3 Cor. Following Tat'ewac'i's comments, the scribe added Orotneç'i's commentary as well. It is interesting to note that in

³¹ See Norayr Polarean, *Mayr c'uc'uk jengrac' srhoc' bakopcamc'* (Grand Catalogue of St. James Manuscripts), vol. 5, p. 375; vol. 8, p. 491 and vol. 11, p. 69. (Jerusalem: St. James, 1966). And *Armenian Writers*, pp. 254-255. Lambronac'i's commentary was translated into Russian and published in 1897.

³² Polarean, *Grand Catalogue*, vol. 11, p. 69.

³³ Wilhelm Friedrich Rink, in his book, *Das Sendschreiben dritte Korintherum*, was the first to call our attention to this manuscript.

³⁴ Anania Sanahnec'i is well known for his commentaries on the books of the Bible including the letters of Paul, the Gospel of Matthew, and the book of Jonah. See, Polarean, *Armenian Writers*, pp. 185-186.

³⁵ Polarean, *Grand Catalogue*, vol. 1, p. 645, and vol. 2, pp. 31, 48 and 527 respectively.

³⁶ Polarean, *Grand Catalogue*, vol. 1, p. 644. On p. 17 of the manuscript, the copier explains that his comments are those of Anania vardapet Sanahnec'i based on the commentaries of St. Ephraem the Syrian and St. John Chrysostom. The note dates the writing of the commentary "i Šew D t'vakanin baryoc'."

³⁷ Polarean, *Armenian Writers*, p. 185.

³⁸ See, for example, manuscripts #560 and 1284 in Polarean's *Grand Catalogue*, vol. 2, p. 589 and vol. 4, p. 477.

both commentaries, 3 Cor is placed after 2 Cor and before Gal, a position that further supports its canonical status.

V. Armenian Canon Lists

The patristic literature of the Armenian Church preserves several lists of the canonical books of the Bible. While a few of these lists agree with that of the Council of Laodicea,³⁹ most of them include several of the New Testament Apocrypha. The disagreement among these lists concerning the New Testament canon, is another indication of the tension between the ecclesiastical list of the canonical books of the New Testament and the popularity of some of the apocryphal writings. This tension continued influencing the canon of the Armenian Bible as late as the time of St. Sargis Šnorhali (12th century). Following the steps of the early church fathers, St. Sargis classifies the books of the New Testament into three categories:⁴⁰ “a. Books that are accepted [by all],” “b. the ones which are doubtful” and “c. those which are completely despised.”⁴¹ What is especially of interest to us is that the list of St. Sargis enumerates 14 letters of St. Paul within the category of the accepted books of the New Testament, excluding Hebrews. Two paragraphs later he discusses Hebrews as a doubtful letter, although he concludes that its authenticity has been approved. If St. Sargis does not count Hebrews as one of the accepted letters of St. Paul, what then was the 14th letter in his collection of the letters of Paul? Could 3 Cor have

³⁹ See for example the list of Anania Širakac'i, “Anania Širakac'woy antip eşjerēn,” *Handes Amsoreā* (1908), p. 20; and Murad, *Haytnut'eann Hovhannu*, pp. MHĒ.

⁴⁰ Sargis Šnorhali, *Meknut'ivm ēōt'eanc' t'it'oc' kat'utikeanc'* (Jerusalem: St. James, 1998), p. 399.

⁴¹ The same dynamics existed in the early church in the East and the West, which led to the categorization of the books of the New Testament to categories such as: canonical, deuterocanonical, apocryphal and heretical. The variations that exist among the lists of Origin, Clement of Alexandria, and others is a consequence of the tension between the popularity and liturgical usage of some apocryphal documents and the limits of the list developed by the church toward the end of the fourth century. Eusebius's commentary on these lists and the variations in the classifications of the book into two, three or four groups, is further evidence of the tension that defined the state of the canon of the Bible.

been part of the Pauline corpus of St. Sargis? His silence on the two New Testament apocryphal books in question is also of interest to us. While neither 3 Cor nor REJ are mentioned in the first or the second categories, these books are not found in the third category as well, which includes apocryphal writings such as the Book of the Infancy of Jesus and the Gospel of Thomas. This situation with the status of the letter to the Hebrews as well as the disappearance of 3 Cor and REJ from the category of rejected books, clearly reflect the reluctance of St. Sargis in completely removing these documents from the Bible or rejecting them as non-canonical.

In his *Ĵamanakagrakan Patmut'ivm*-, “Chronological History,” the 13th century renowned vardapet and abbot of the Monastery of Geghark, Mxit'ar Ayrevanc'i, offers a discussion of “The Apocryphal Books of the Jews.” At the end of his discussion, Ayrevanc'i adds a list of seven New Testament Apocryphal writings, which includes the general letters attributed to Barnabas, Jude, Thomas, and Clement. Meanwhile, at the end of his work Ayrevanc'i left us with a list of the writings accepted as canonical during his time. The title of the list reads, “The Order of the Books of the Bible verified by Sarkawag Vardapet and written by me, Mxit'ar Vardapet.” This suggests an even earlier date for the list. According to Armenian historians, including Kirakos Ganjakec'i, a certain Sarkavak Vardapet is known to have lived in the first half of the 12th century. In his article “Mxit'ar Ayrevanc'i and A Newly Discovered Writing by Him,” Fr. Gargein Galemkaryan published the list and discusses the textual variations among the various versions of the list. He classifies the manuscript evidence to three variations. What is of interest to us is that all three variations include REJ as part of the New Testament canon. In all of them, this apocryphal writing comes immediately after the Revelation of John. In two of these manuscripts, REJ and Revelation of John are placed at the end of the canon after the Pauline Corpus. In the third witness, the two writings appear after the catholic epistles and the Appeal of Euthalius and before the Pauline Corpus. All three variations of the list include also 3 Cor which in all of

them is placed after 2 Cor and before Gal. Finally, The apocryphal Appeal of Euthalius is also found but only in two of the three variations of the list.

Another list of the canonical books of the Bible is found in a 13th century writing commonly referred to as *Girk' Patčarac'*, "The Book of Causes" or "The Book of Reasons." The list is attributed to the late 12th century and early 13th century Grigor the son of Abas, and the abbot of the Sanahin monastery (1214-19). The list includes 3 Cor as part of the canonical books of the New Testament. The position of the book in the list, after 2 Cor and before Galatians, emphasizes its canonical status, as opposed to the Book of Revelation, for example, which is left at the end of the list and is not treated as a canonical book.⁴²

In addition to his commentaries on the books of the Bible, Grigor Tat'ewac'i composed his own list of the canonical books of the Bible. Both 3 Cor and REJ are found in this list. REJ is inserted after the Revelation, which comes after the Gospel of John and before the Acts of the Apostles. 3 Cor, on the other hand, is shifted toward the end of the list of the canonical books after Philemon. The list ends with the apocryphal Letter of Thaddeus. This is followed by the following remark, "And as Clement and Anania of Damascus state, we received six more books in the church which are the Reading of Jacob, the two Apostolic Canons, the Sayings of Justus, the Book of Dionysius the Areopagite, and the Preaching of the Apostle Peter."⁴³ This, according to Tat'ewac'i's comment, adds up the books of the New Testament to 36.

Manuscript #345 in the St. James collection of the Armenian monastery in Jerusalem includes a list of the canonical books of the Bible.⁴⁴ The list is attributed to Arakel, the 15th century bishop of the Siwnik region in Armenia. The author of the list identify himself saying, "I, Lord Arakel the overseer of the Siwnik region, deprived and bare of

any grace, composed the list of the books of the testaments of the Bible." Following the listing of the books of the Old Testament, indicating their total number to be 44, the author indicates the total number of the canonical books of the New Testament to be 28, which he then lists. The apocryphal REJ is mentioned as the last book in the list of the canonical books of the New Testament.

The heading of manuscript #1928 of the St. James collection in Jerusalem reads: "A List of the Holy Scriptures which is copied by Grigor Eramec, who thus ordered the books of the Old and New Testaments, how many they are and which books of the Old and New Testaments are holy."⁴⁵ The copier of the manuscript lists the names of all the books of the Old and New Testaments in their proper order. Among his list of canonical books of the New Testament we find 3 Cor, RBJ and the Letter of Thaddeus. The copier concludes his list indicating that the total number of the New Testament books is 30. He then adds that six more New Testament apocryphal books were received by the Church, according to a certain Clement and Anania of Damascus. He mentions the name of five of them: the Reading of Jacob, the Apostolic Canons, the Sayings of Justus, the Book of Dionysius the Areopagite, and the Preaching of Peter.

VI. Bible Manuscripts

Like the rest of the New Testament Apocrypha, most of the Armenian apocryphal literature associated with New Testament has never made it into, nor have any association with, the Armenian version of the sacred collection of the New Testament. They have been copied and preserved as pious religious literature or for the sake of spiritual entertainment. However, the few writings, which were inserted in the New Testament canon remained part of it for centuries and were copied and preserved as part of the Armenian New Testament until its publication. Among

⁴² N. Akinian, "Grigor ordi abacy belinak patčarac' groc'," *Handes Amsorea* (1907), pp. 132-135; "patčarac' girčē," *Handes Amsorea* (1907), pp. 228-235 and 271-274, and Murad, *Haytnut eam Hovhannu*, p. M&D.

⁴³ *Girk' Harc'manc' Grigori Tat'ewac'woy* (Constantinople, 1729), p. 451.

⁴⁴ Pokarean, *Grand Catalogue*, vol. 2, p. 240.

⁴⁵ Pokarean, *Mayr č'uc'ak jerugrac'*, vol. 6, p. 427ff. The manuscript is copied in Jerusalem and dated AD 1648.

the latter group we mention 3 Cor, REJ, the Petition of Euthalius, in addition to a forth apocryphon called *The Sailing of the Apostle Paul to Rome*. These four writings are found in almost all the Armenian manuscripts of the Bible.

The oldest extant Armenian manuscript of a complete Bible, i.e. manuscript #1925 of the St. James collection in Jerusalem, ca. 1269, inserts REJ after the Book of Revelation which comes after the Gospel of John. REJ in this manuscript is followed by the Pauline corpus, which ends with "The Sailing of Paul." The Book of Acts followed by the catholic letters come after the Pauline corpus. The collection ends with the "Appeal of Euthalius." Manuscript #5 of the Mekhitarist collection in Venice is another old manuscript of a complete Bible in Armenian, whose compilation and copying is attributed to the 13th century Gevorg Skewiac'i. This version of the Armenian Bible was widely copied during the Cilician era and was used by Voskan, Zohrabian and Bagratuni to prepare their published editions of the Bible. This manuscript inserts the catholic letters after the Gospels and the Acts. The book of revelation is inserted after the catholic letters. The Pauline corpus, which comes after the Book of Revelation, ends with the "Appeal of Euthalius", the "Sailing of Paul" and 3 Cor.

In addition to the two oldest manuscripts of a complete Armenian Bible mentioned above, 3 Cor, REJ, *The Petition of Euthalius*, and *The Sailing of the Apostle Paul to Rome* are found in many of the complete and partial Armenian Bibles. They appear in different places in the list of the canonical books. In most of the manuscripts they are usually at the end of the canon indicating a deuterocanonical or semi-canonical status. In some manuscripts, however, 3 Cor appears after 2 Cor and before Galatians, and REJ appears after Revelation and before the Pauline corpus or the catholic letters.⁴⁶ *The Sailing of the Apostle Paul to Rome*.

⁴⁶ See, for example, manuscripts #234, 254, 255, 523, 540, 560, 736, 1127, 1284, 1932, 1933, 1934 and others of the St. James collection in Jerusalem.

can also be found sometimes at the end of the Pauline corpus and before the Book of Acts or the Book of Revelation.⁴⁷

It is obvious that these four apocryphal writings received a special status among the Armenians than the rest of the New Testament Apocrypha. None of the Armenian apocryphal books of the New Testament, for example, has been incorporated into the liturgical cycle of the Armenian Church. Nor have any of the fathers of the Armenian Church commented on them or referred to them as part of the divine revelation and inspiration. Furthermore, none of these writings have been incorporated, as divinely inspired literature, into the various sacraments of the church. Exceptions to all the above generalization are 3 Cor, REJ and The Petition of Euthalius. 3 Cor is found in several lectionaries of the Armenian Church where it is inserted as one of the scripture readings of the day.⁴⁸ REJ is read in its entirety on the feast day of the "Evangelist John and the Apostle James, the sons of Zebedee" as one of the scripture reading of the day.⁴⁹ It is also incorporated into the "Service of the Burial of a Priest". A verse from REJ is still part of a prayer in the Eucharist of the Armenian Church.⁵⁰

As we reach the end of our exploration, it is worth summarizing the theme and main contents of the four apocryphal writings that made it to the New Testament Canon of the Armenian Church:

⁴⁷ See, for example, manuscripts #255, 540, 1127, 1297 and others of the St. James collection in Jerusalem.

⁴⁸ Vahan Hovhannessian, *Third Corinthians: Reclaiming Paul for Christian Orthodoxy* (New York: Peter Lang, 2000), pp. 12-16.

⁴⁹ See, for example, *Chashots' Girk'*, (Jerusalem: St. James, 1967), pp. 370-372.

⁵⁰ For a detailed examination of the incorporation of REJ in the Armenian Church liturgy see the author's article, "The Repose of the Blessed John in the Armenian Bible and the Acts of John" in: P. Piovanelli (ed.), *Bringing the Underground to the Foreground: New Perspectives on Jewish and Christian Apocryphal Texts and Traditions. Proceedings of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha Section of the Society for Biblical Literature International Meeting Held in Groningen, The Netherlands, July 25-28, 2004* (forthcoming).

1. *The Rest of the Evangelist John*

This is a compilation of speeches and prayers attributed to the apostle John. The introductory paragraph defines the setting where the apostle is surrounded by his disciples on a Sunday. The introductory paragraph is followed by the Apostle's speech to his disciples in which we find many direct or indirect quotations, or echoes, from John's canonical letters, his Gospel and the Book of Revelation. A two-part Eucharistic prayer recited by John for the breaking of the communion bread follows, after which the Apostle takes a piece for himself and shares the rest with his disciples. The third part of this Apocrypha is the Evangelist's voluntary burial. He orders his beloved disciples to dig a grave for him in which he voluntarily rests while offering his final prayer.

2. *Third Corinthians*

A two-letter correspondence between the Corinthian Church and the apostle Paul. The main theme of the correspondence is the doctrine of the fleshly resurrection of the dead. The correspondence offers also an orthodox rebottling of the Gnostic teachings regarding the creation of the world, God's almightiness and the virgin birth of Jesus from Mary. This correspondence circulated also as part of the Acts of Paul in the Coptic Church.

3. *The Petition of Euthalius*

Attributed to Euthalius, and preserved mainly in Armenian, although Greek witnesses were also discovered at the turn of the previous century, this writing is a petition and exhortation to pursue the Christian way, to endure the consequent challenges and suffering and not to give up. While the paragraph is not divided into verses, almost all the manuscripts add the Armenian word *tunk IĒ* "27 verses" at the end of the writing.

4. *The sailings of the Apostle Paul to Rome*

This one paragraph narrative contains 5 verses. It narrates the path of the Apostle's journey, and the various stops, from Caesarea to Rome. It is simply a compilation of facts and names collected from the canonical books of Acts and the Pauline Corpus.

VII. *A List of the Armenian New Testament Apocrypha:*

As mentioned earlier, the majority of the New Testament Apocrypha were not part of the canon of the Armenian Bible. They were copied and preserved in manuscripts independent of the Bible. The following is a list of the New Testament Apocryphal writings found in Armenian Manuscripts:

1. Gospel of Infancy or The Book of the Infancy of Christ attributed to James the brother of the Lord.⁵¹
2. The Memoirs of Pilate⁵²
3. The Epistle of Pilate⁵³

⁵¹ See F. C. Conybeare, "Protoevangelium Iacobi, (from an Armenian Manuscript in the Library of the Mechitarists in Venice)," *The American Journal of Theology*, I (1897), pp. 424-442; and N. Mar, "Girk mankut'ean Yisus?" *Bazmavep* (1892), pp. 247-253 and 290-295. For a comparison of the text of this document in the Armenian, Syriac and Arab traditions see, Paul Peeters, *Évangiles apocryphes. II. L'Évangile de l'Enfance*. Rédactions syriaque, arabe et arméniennes traduites et annotées (Paris: Auguste Picard, 1914). A study of another Armenian manuscript, #1432 in Jerusalem, see S. Mkhsyan, "Avetaran Mankutean Krisdosi," *Sion*, (1972), pp. 122-131. For the Armenian text see Esayi Tayec'i, *Ankanon girik' Nor Ktakaranuts'* (Uncanonical books of the New Testament), pp. 1-126, and a second variation on pp. 127-233. Fragments of the same apocryphal writing are also preserved in Armenian. See, Tayec'i, pp. 257-312.

⁵² See Esayi Tayec'i, *Ankanon girik' nor ktakaranuts'*, pp. 313-358. Some manuscripts add the following phrase as a subtitle: "Memoirs of what happened to Christ in the presence of Pontius Pilate, the ruler of the Jews." This is the Armenian translation of a version of the *Acta Pilati*. Its text agrees with that of Tischendorf's "X" recension. See Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha* (Lipsiae, 1876), pp. 210-486. Fredrick C. Conybeare published his comments on the Armenian version with its Greek and Latin re-translation by him in *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica* (Oxford, 1896), pp. 59-132. This apocryphal writing is known in the Church in the West as the "Gospel of Nicodemus." This title, which gained popularity in the medieval times, was based on the assumption that the author of the original Hebrew text of this apocryphal writing was Nicodemus. See Schneemelcher, pp. 501-536.

⁵³ Ibid., pp. 379-380. An abbreviated variation of the same apocrypha is also preserved in Armenian, pp. 379-380.

4. The Letter of Publius Lentulus.⁵⁴
5. Gospel of Nicodemus⁵⁵
6. The Story of the Paralyzed whom Jesus Healed
7. The Vision of the Most Holy Theotokos⁵⁶
8. The Saying of the Blessed Nicodemus Concerning the Repose of Mary the Theotokos and Ever-virgin.⁵⁷
9. Acts of the Apostles Peter and Paul⁵⁸
10. The Witnessing of the Chief and Praised Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul⁵⁹
11. The Witnessing of the Apostle Peter.⁶⁰
12. The Witnessing of the Holy Apostle Paul.⁶¹
13. The Vision of the Apostle Paul.⁶²
14. Third Corinthians.⁶³
15. The Letter of Dionesius to Timothy the disciple of Paul concerning the death of Paul and Peter.⁶⁴

⁵⁴ Ibid., pp. 381-382. This letter of two pages in Tayets'i's book, appears to be the Armenian translation of a Latin version which was discovered among the writings of the 11 century Anselm of Canterbury. It is a letter by a supposed contemporary of Pilate to the Roman Senate. The Latin text of the letter was first published, with minor variations, by Fabricius in his *Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti* (Hamburg, 1703). This apocryphal letter contains the first description of the personal appearance of Christ.

⁵⁵ For an English Translation of this apocryphal writing see, F. C. Conybeare, *Acta Pilati*, *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, IV (1896), pp. 59-132.

⁵⁶ "Which the most blessed saw concerning the suffering of the sinner." See *Essayi Tayets'i*, pp. 383-401. Several variations of the same writing are preserved in Armenian. See Tayets'i, pp. 402-450.

⁵⁷ Paul Vetter, "Die armenische Dormitio Mariae," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, LXXXIV (1902), pp. 321-349; and Hakobos Tashean, "Anavarukhan t'ult Dionesiosi arispagac'woy ai: Titos vasm mn-jman-Maremyu" *Handes Amsovea* (1893), pp. 69-71. For the Armenian text see, Tayets'i, pp. 451-478.

⁵⁸ K'erobē Ch'rakean, *Ankanon girē Arak elukank*, (Venice: San Lazzaro, 1904), pp. 1-29. This apocryphal writing is preserved in Armenian in several versions. For an abbreviated version of the above, see Ch'rakean, pp. 30-45.

⁵⁹ Ibid., pp. 46-50.

⁶⁰ Ibid., pp. 51-56.

⁶¹ Ibid., pp. 57-61.

⁶² With the subtitle: "How the Angels Carried His Soul Away." Ibid., pp. 62-84. Different versions of this apocryphal writing, with different subtitles, are preserved in Armenian. See pp. 85-100 and 101-109.

⁶³ See also the author's book, *Third Corinthians: Reclaiming Paul for Christian Orthodoxy* (New York: Peter Lang, 2000).

⁶⁴ Ibid., pp. 110-122.

16. The Story of St. Thekla of the Georgian
17. Concerning the Apostle Andrew and his miracles which the Lord performed through him and through Matthew in the Land of the Cannibals⁶⁵
18. The Witnessing of the Apostle Andrew who Suffered in the Garden, before one of the December Noels.⁶⁶
19. The Story of the Apostles Andrew and Matthew as to How They Went to the Land of the Cannibals.⁶⁷
20. The Story of How St. Jacob (James) Went to Spain and Returned to Jerusalem and was Beheaded.⁶⁸
21. The Acts of John the Evangelist.⁶⁹
22. Concerning the Exile of St. John.⁷⁰
23. Concerning Mironos and his entire household and what happened through John.⁷¹
24. Concerning how the Gospel was narrated by John.⁷²
25. The Rest of the Evangelist John.⁷³
26. The Story of the Apostles of Christ, John and James, the Sons of Zebedee.⁷⁴
27. The Witnessing of the Holy Apostle Philip.⁷⁵
28. Canons of the Apostle Philip.⁷⁶

⁶⁵ Ibid., pp. 124-145.

⁶⁶ Ibid., pp. 146-167.

⁶⁷ Ibid., pp. 168-173.

⁶⁸ "Being dead in the body, he went to Spain, who is now called St. Jacob." Ibid., pp. 174-189.

⁶⁹ Ibid., pp. 190-221.

⁷⁰ Ibid., pp. 222-229.

⁷¹ Ibid., pp. 230-240. There are several apocryphal documents similar to this one narrating the miraculous ministry of the Evangelist John. See, Ch'rakean, pp. 241-277.

⁷² Ibid., pp. 286-292.

⁷³ See the author's article "The Repose of the Blessed John in the Armenian Bible and the Acts of John" n. 76 supra; also Hovhann Zohrabian, *Ashtutshunch' Mateam Hin ew Nor Kiakarnats* (Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments) (Venice: San Lazzaro, 1805), pp. 27-29; and Hovsep Gatchian, *Dormitio Beati Joannis* (The Rest of the Blessed John), (Vienna: Mechitaristen-Buchdruckerei, 1877).

⁷⁴ Ibid., pp. 293-299.

⁷⁵ Ibid., pp. 300-320. The same apocryphal writing exists in different versions. Ibid., pp. 321-328.

⁷⁶ Ibid., pp. 329-332.

29. The Witnessing of the Holy Apostle Bartholomew.⁷⁷
30. The Discovery of the Relics of the Holy Apostle Bartholomew.⁷⁸
31. In Memory of the Holy Apostle Thomas.⁷⁹
32. The Witnessing of the Apostle Thomas which took place in India.⁸⁰
33. The Story of the Holy Apostle Thomas.⁸¹
34. The Story Concerning the Discovery of the Holy Apostle Thomas.⁸²
35. The Witnessing of the Holy Apostle and Evangelist Matthew.⁸³
36. The Witnessing of James the Brother of the Lord.⁸⁴
37. The Holy Apostle Thaddeus Concerning the first discovery of the Holy Cross.⁸⁵
38. The Holy Apostle Thaddeus Concerning the Resurrection of the Dead.⁸⁶
39. The Witnessing of the Holy Apostle Simon the Zealot.⁸⁷
40. Concerning the Holy Apostles as to Who They Were and How They Were Called for the Ministry.⁸⁸
41. Concerning the Twelve Holy Apostles.⁸⁹
42. The Teachings of the Apostles as to How They Were Completed and Exist Until Now (by Epiphanius the Cyprian).⁹⁰
43. Concerning the Apostles as to who among them were married and who were not.⁹¹
44. The Letter of Barnabas.⁹²
45. The Letter Sent by James the Bishop of Jerusalem to Kodratos.⁹³
46. The Letter of the Armenian King Abgar and the Preaching of the Apostle Thaddeus.⁹⁴
47. The Petition of Euthalius.⁹⁵
48. Concerning the Seventy Two Disciples of the Lord.⁹⁶
49. Concerning the Realization of the Disciples.⁹⁷
50. The Faithful Women Who Witnessed.⁹⁸
51. The Canons and Laws Which the Holy Disciples of Christ Established.⁹⁹
52. The Laws and Canons of the Holy Apostles by Clement, the Apostle of the Heathens.¹⁰⁰
53. Canons of the Fathers, the Followers of the Apostles.¹⁰¹
54. The Canons of the Apostle Phillip.¹⁰²
55. The Laws of the Canons of St. Thaddeus in the City of Urha.¹⁰³
56. The Holy Apostle Thaddeus Concerning the Resurrection of the Dead.¹⁰⁴
57. The Sailing of the Apostle Paul.¹⁰⁵

⁷⁷ Ibid., pp. 333-357. Some manuscripts add "and Jude." An abbreviated variation of the same writing survives also in Armenian. See pp. 358-364.

⁷⁸ Ibid., pp. 365-368.

⁷⁹ G. Garity, "La passion arménienne de S. Thomas l'apôtre et son modèle grec," *Le Muséon*, LXXXIV (1971), pp. 151-195; H. S. Anassian, "Mi ancanôt heknak ew nra erki noragjwrt hrataraku'wné." For the Armenian text see Ch'rakean, pp. 369-387.

⁸⁰ K'eroḅ Ch'rakean, *Ankanon giré' Arak'elakank*, pp. 388-400. An abbreviated version of the same story is also available in Armenian manuscripts. See pp. 428-436.

⁸¹ Ibid., pp. 401-416.

⁸² Ibid., pp. 417-427.

⁸³ Ibid., pp. 437-448.

⁸⁴ Ibid., pp. 449-452.

⁸⁵ Ibid., pp. 453-461.

⁸⁶ Ibid., pp. 462-463.

⁸⁷ Ibid., pp. 464-465.

⁸⁸ Ibid., pp. 466-470.

⁸⁹ Ibid., pp. 471-473.

⁹⁰ Ibid., pp. 474-475.

⁹¹ Ibid., pp. 476-477.

⁹² Anassian, *Manr Erker*, p. 159.

⁹³ Anassian, *Manr Erker*, p. 159.

⁹⁴ Anassian, *Manr Erker*, p. 160.

⁹⁵ A. Vartanian, *Matenagrut'yunk Eutadi*, (Vienna: 1930).

⁹⁶ Anassian, *Manr Erker*, p. 161.

⁹⁷ Anassian, *Manr Erker*, p. 161.

⁹⁸ Anassian, *Manr Erker*, p. 161.

⁹⁹ Hakovbos Tashean, *Vardapetut'ien Arak'eloc' anovaverakan kanonac' matane, T'utt' Hakobay ar Kodratos ew Kanonik' T'addai* (Vienna, 1896). For the Armenian text see, Anassian, *Manr Erker*, p. 161.

¹⁰⁰ Vazgen Hakobyani, *Kanonagirk' hayoc'*, vol. 1, (Erevan, 1964), pp. 67-100 and 550-557; and Anassian, *Manr Erker*, p. 161.

¹⁰¹ Vazgen Hakobyani, *Kanonagirk' hayoc'*, vol. 1, (Erevan, 1964), pp. 101-113 and 558-559; and Anassian, *Manr Erker*, p. 161.

¹⁰² Anassian, *Manr Erker*, p. 161.

¹⁰³ Anassian, *Manr Erker*, p. 161.

¹⁰⁴ Anassian, *Manr Erker*, p. 161.

¹⁰⁵ Some manuscripts add, "to Rome." Ibid., p. 123.

58. Acts of Enlightenment.¹⁰⁶
59. Concerning the Exile of St. John.¹⁰⁷
60. The Witnessing of the Holy Apostle Titus.¹⁰⁸
61. The Story of Judas of Iscariot.¹⁰⁹

VIII. Conclusion

The New Testament Apocrypha has definitely been an important component of the Christian experience in Armenia. Our brief survey of the earliest literature of the Armenian Church confirms that apocryphal writings were incorporated in the Armenian version of the Bible, as early as its translation to Armenian. Several of these apocryphal writings remained in the canon of the New Testament as late as the publication of the Armenian Bible. Some of them were treated not only as canonical, but also as genuine and authentic writings of the apostles.

The lack of a decisive Armenian Church council to fix the list of the books of the Bible, or to receive a universally confirmed list, left the collection of biblical books throughout the centuries open to new entries and removals. A "loose canon," therefore, is definitely an appropriate term to describe the state of the New Testament canon of the Armenian Bible in general. In fact, the New Testament canon remains not fully defined in the Armenian Church. Outside influences, such as Roman Catholic supervision of the early publications of the Armenian Bible and Protestant direction of the Society of Biblical Literature which published the later editions of the classical Armenian version of the Bible, gradually imposed the commonly recognized canonical list of the New Testament on the later published editions of the Armenian Bible.

The absence of such a council decision left the fathers of the Armenian Church in the midst of a tension between two forces in the

early centuries of Christianity. These were the gradually developing universal list of the canonical books of the Bible, and the popularity of some of the New Testament apocrypha that were used by the early evangelists and preachers of Christianity in Armenia. The tension between these two forces can be clearly traced in the different lists of the canonical books of the New Testament by the various fathers of the Armenian Church.

¹⁰⁶ Miracles attributed to the apostle John. See pp. 190-221.

¹⁰⁷ Pp. 222-229.

¹⁰⁸ Anassian, *Mann Erker*, p. 160.

¹⁰⁹ Anassian, *Mann Erker*, p. 160.

AECA Pilgrimage to Holy Russia: A Reflection

ANDREI PETRINE

*Before them spreads
The white-stoned Moscow,
and like fire, Its golden crosses to the skies aspire,
And churches raise their shimmering beads.
Ab friends! How pleased I was, elated,
When that wide view quite suddenly
Of gardens, palaces, cathedrals, plated
Cupolas appeared in front of me. ...
Moscow ... how much within that sound there lies
To make a Russian's heart awake,
How many echoes does it give and take.*

Alexander Pushkin (from Evgeny Onegin)

THIS YEAR, with the assistance of McCabe Pilgrimage, AECA members and others, under the spiritual leadership of the Rt. Rev'd Honorary Assistant Bishop in London, Robert Ladds, visited Holy Russia. For the AECA this event was important not only because we haven't travelled to Russia for some years now, but especially because the goal of this visit was the restoration and strengthening of the special ties between our Churches which has lasted many decades. Another task for our pilgrimage was to visit the Holy sites of Russia that are inseparably linked with the life and faith of Russian orthodox people. By the mercy of God the planned trip surpassed all our expectations and those who took part in it, experienced many of God's blessings, enriched their knowledge of Orthodoxy and of the Russian people.

Thus, on Monday 3rd September 2012, thirty-eight pilgrims from Great Britain arrived in the capital of Russia – Moscow – and lodged at the religious hotel by the Danilov Monastery. Danilov Monastery is lo-



Danilov Monastery

cated on the right bank of the Moskva River. Since 1983 it has served as the "headquarters" of the Russian Orthodox Church. The monastery was constructed in the 13th century by Daniel, the son of Alexander Nevsky, who accepted the monastic vow and lived in this monastery. This monastery was the last monastery in Moscow to be closed by the Soviet authorities (in 1929), and the first one that was returned to the Moscow Patriarchy (in 1983).

Our five-day stay in Moscow begun with visiting one of the most beautiful and flourishing monasteries of the Russian Orthodox Church: The Novodevichy Monastery, is perhaps, the most well-known monastery of the capital. It has hardly changed since the 17th century, and in 2004 it became a UNESCO world culture and heritage site. The monastery is popular not only because of its ancient cathedral and other architectural monuments, but also as a cemetery where celebrities have been buried. Our immediate overwhelming impression was that Moscow becomes more and more an Orthodox city – new churches are being built almost in every area and the ancient buildings are carefully restored.

While in Moscow we could not stay away from the wonderful cultural heritage of Russia, so we visited the famous Tretyakov Gallery, the Pushkin Fine Arts Museum, and a trip on the famous Mos-




Novodevichy Monastery

cow Metro. I was particularly happy when, to my surprise, (not to say about the curiosity of the Muscovites) Bishop Robert suddenly stopped the group right in the middle of the Station bearing the name of "The Revolutionary Square" and invited us to say the Daily Office! This prayer was very much valued and also because we didn't lose a single member of our group in the maze of the massive underground structure.

Following this we visited Red Square and the well-known Armoury Chamber. In connection with this it must be mentioned that this year Russia celebrates two hundred years since its victory over the Napoleonic invasion in 1812. It seemed that the entire nation was jubilant: Red Square was turned into an open-air theatre with live reproduction of battles, and we admired the fighting, the dancing of Cossacks on their horses and were deafened by the salvo of the guns!

Inside the grounds of the Kremlin we visited the Cathedrals of the Assumption and Annunciation. The Cathedral, which specifically needs to be mentioned, because it has become a symbol of Moscow, is St. Basil's Cathedral on Red Square. Its image appears on tourist postcards probably even more often than the Kremlin itself. The Cathedral history began in 1555 when its construction was ordered by Ivan the Terrible. Since then much has changed around it, but the Cathedral, as the ornament of Moscow, stands unchanged.

But, of course, speaking about the Moscow churches the first that comes to mind for many people is a well-known Cathedral of Christ the Saviour. To visit it is a "must do" thing, for such beauty could hardly be found in any other religious site of the city. The cathedral is built in a very beautiful place – on the bank of the Moskva River, in the centre of the Russian capital, and it is the highest Orthodox Church in the world! Apart from its architectural significance, the Cathedral has a very dramatic history. After the long construction, its consecration took place on the day of the coronation of Alexander III on the 26th May 1883. The Cathedral existed until 1931 when it was blown up by the Soviet Government. After disintegration of the Soviet Union it was decided to



Cathedral of Christ the Saviour with St. Basil's in the foreground

restore the Cathedral. This began in 1990 and its consecration took place in April 2000.

One of the highlights of our visit was the meeting with His Grace – Metropolitan Hilarion of Volokolamsk, the chairman of the Department of External Church Relations, and a permanent member of the Holy Synod of the Patriarchate of Moscow. On 6th September he kindly welcomed our group at his headquarters inside the monastery. His Grace explained to us the main aspects of the work of the Department of external Church Relations, while Bishop Robert praised Metropolitan "for the stability of his position in the face of the challenges of the modern world". Metropolitan Hilarion noted that it is with much regret that the Russian Orthodox Church observes the liberalisation

processes in the Church of England and sees it as an obstacle in the dialogue between Orthodox and Anglican Churches. In particular, he stated that the introduction by the Church of England of female priesthood, as well as female episcopate practically closes possibility of any further discussion of recognition of an Apostolic Succession of the Anglican Church by the Russian Orthodox Church. The Metropolitan also expressed the regret caused by the process of marginalisation and exclusion from active Church life of those Anglican Bishops, Priests and laypeople who aspire to follow the doctrine of the Gospel and traditions of the Ancient Church.

After the exchange of addresses and gifts, His Grace kindly answered questions regarding relationships between the Church and the State, as well as the future of religious education in Russia. I think we all left with mixed feelings and it would not be wrong to say that the sour difficulties in the dialogue between our churches that were recognized at this meeting, helped to make clear the nature of the historic struggles present in the universal Body of Christ. The multicoloured spirit of the Anglican Communion echoes this struggle in its core aspiration: to keep unity in diversity. Even our group vividly illustrated this constant tension with Anglicans of "high", "low" and "middle-of-the-road" convictions praying together daily along with Orthodox and Catholics. Often we struggled to understand the meaning of certain words, yet joining in together in the familiar words of the Lord's Prayer and worshipping One and True God: Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Another time of unity was when our diverse group developed a unique sense of harmony. We were on our way to Moscow to catch the train to St. Petersburg when we were stuck in an eight hour traffic jam. The claustrophobic atmosphere and our empty stomachs produced a most lively and unified choir! We sung well-known hymns and even attempted to learn new ones with cheerfulness and enthusiasm. Indeed, our unity is often expressed at the times of trials and hardships!

It is worth to mention that apart from big cities like Moscow and St. Petersburg we visited churches in Uglich, Kostroma and Yaroslavl,



Pilgrims with Fr. Dyagilev at the church of St. Alexander Nevsky

which are historic, cultural and religious centres of Russia. In contrast to the big, modern cities these small provincial towns still retain the spirit of old Russia. We could see small, often poor, traditional wooden houses and watch the typical local "babushkas". One of the most moving experiences was to hear a group of singers at the Church of St. Elijah singing a cappella the Lord's Prayer as well as local folk songs. Those special moments remind us that the big things often happen in very small places.

But the big is still attractive and important and St. Petersburg is certainly contains these qualities. We enjoyed the beauty of this magnificent city on the Neva-River for four whole days. We visited the Peter & Paul Fortress, Alexandro-Nevsky Lavra, Petrodvorets, the Russian Museum, the Church of St. Nicholas, Kazan Cathedral, had a cruise on the Neva-River and of course viewed the famous Hermitage. Visits to holy places as well as museums or (at our choice) an opera or ballet, simply overwhelmed our pilgrims with the abundance of information and sights. Some even expressed the desire to return to this city again and to have a more detailed and unhurried exploration.

But in my view, the real "pearl" of our St. Petersburg's experience was the visit of the little church of St. Alexander Nevsky in Krasnoe Selo, in the outskirts of the city. On 11th September Fr. Alexander Dy-

agilev, the Priest-in-Charge of the above mentioned church and the members of the worshipping community warmly welcomed us to their special place of worship. Special not only because the church has a rich history or even because the present Patriarch of all Russia attended this church as a boy while his father served there as a parish priest in the 1950's. The members of the church met the pilgrims with such friendliness and hospitality, that it left a lasting impression on all of us. After the tour of the church Fr. Alexander led evening prayer in English with members of the choir singing responses in Church Slavonic. Then we had the most splendid lunch in the church's Parish Room. The overall atmosphere of welcome made the day and the whole pilgrimage complete. My guess (and the prayer of my heart) is that it is through small meetings like this, where love and peace abound, that the prayer of our Lord, "That they all may be one", might find its sweet fulfillment.

This very special and important pilgrimage has been rather fruitful and useful. We hope that aided by the prayers of all the saints the Lord yet again will we strengthen Orthodox and Anglican Christians, as well as all true-believing Christians all over the world. So that in the common effort for the Faith and virtue with united hearts and minds we may glorify our Triune God. Amen!


Eastern Travel Guides: Taking a group to Istanbul

JONATHAN COLLIS

OVER THE YEARS I have taken various parish and student groups to Istanbul, and now that the budget airlines have taken to using Istanbul's second airport, Sabiha Gokcen, getting to Istanbul is as easy as it has ever been. While by no means as cheap as it once was, Istanbul can still be done on a budget, and much is relatively straightforward without recourse to a travel agent. All but the most basic hotels have websites, and can be booked in advance, as can airport transfers. For the moment the extensive work connecting Europe to Asia by a railway tunnel under the Bosphorus means that there are no international trains from Turkey to the rest of continental Europe - but in 2015 (perhaps) the new line will transform train travel to and within Istanbul.

I have found that staying in Beyoglu, rather than the old city, works well. The range of hotels and restaurants is better, the transport links to the centre are excellent, and it is an area not nearly as touristy as Sultanahmet. Moreover there is a fine selection of churches to be found locally, including the Anglican chaplaincy which is mainly based at the Crimean Memorial Church (Christ Church) not far from Tunel. There the chaplain, Canon Ian Sherwood, exercises a remarkable ministry, and the 10 am Sunday Eucharist is well worth attending. I have found the Residence Hotel just off Istiklal Caddesi comfortable, convenient and reasonably priced.

All the standard guides (Lonely Planet, Rough Guide etc) to Istanbul are adequate, and there is a volume 'The Churches of Istanbul', published by Uranus and easily available in Istanbul which is a useful guide to not only the main but also some of the more obscure churches of the city. The main starting points, of course, are Hagia Sophia (pictured, opposite) and St Saviour in Chora (the latter best accessed by taxi) for Byzantine splendour, closely followed by the Phanar with the Ecumenical Patriarch's cathedral of St George. One can easily find one-



self at a weekday vespers in a congregation of less than a dozen that includes His All Holiness himself. A trip to the Phanar can be combined easily enough with St Saviour in Chora, but an option too is to visit Eyup, just up the Golden Horn. There is one of the holiest shrines of Islam, centred on the tomb of the standard bearer of the Prophet, and to this day is a great centre of popular Islam, with an array of stalls selling Muslim tat. Around the shrine and mosque - at which visitors are made very welcome - are many fine Ottoman tombs, and a little beyond is the great cemetery with the Pierre Loti café at the top easily reached by cable car. Not to be missed too is the recently founded museum of Jewish life in Istanbul, tucked away in an old synagogue in the back streets of Karakoy, and the Mevlevi museum in Tunel, dedicated to the Mevlevi Sufi sect best known for the whirling dervishes.

The Istanbul public transport works most efficiently with an Oystercard type system, available from Taksim and Tunel. Those places that are not walkable from a tram or metro stop can be reached by taxi cheaply. Like many great cities, it is surprising how narrowly focussed is the main tourist area: once one gets beyond it the atmosphere markedly changes. The Christian presence in the city is now a very marginal one, and so expressions of solidarity are especially valuable.

Book Reviews

HUGH WYBREW

Relics and Miracles: Two theological essays. Sergius Bulgakov (translated by Boris Jakim). £16.99. Eerdmans 2011. ISBN: 978-0-8028-6331-1.

Icons and the Name of God. Sergius Bulgakov (translated by Boris Jakim). £16.99. Eerdmans 2012. ISBN: 978-0-8028-6664-6.

SERGIUS BULGAKOV is best known for his Lesser and Greater Trilogies. But he wrote a number of shorter works, conveniently listed in the translator's introduction to the first of these two books. The essay 'On Holy Relics' was written in 1918 in response to the Bolshevik desecration of relics immediately after the Revolution. Much more than a protest, it is perhaps the first attempt to set out a theological justification for the veneration of saints' relics. Bulgakov sees such veneration as rooted in the incarnation and the consequent deification of humanity in its entirety, including the body. Within the corruptible relics of the saints are their incorruptible risen bodies. The incarnation is central too to the later essay, written in 1932, 'On the Gospel Miracles'. Bulgakov rejects the distinction made by the Tome of Leo, read at the Council of Chalcedon in 451, between what Jesus did as God and what he did as man, as dividing his two natures, divine and human. He insists it was the one person of Jesus Christ who in his divine humanity worked such signs of God's love for humankind.

The essay on 'The Icon and its veneration' was written in 1930. The practice of making and venerating icons was declared legitimate by the Seventh Ecumenical Council of 787. But it provided no dogmatic definition of icons or justification for their veneration. Bulgakov was unhappy with the arguments of both iconoclasts and iconodules, based, he believed, on an inadequate understanding of the incarnation. Here too he argues that there can be no separation between the divine and

human natures in Christ. An icon of Christ does not depict his human nature only; it depicts the one divine humanity of the incarnate Word, and a properly blessed icon radiates divine energy. That energy is contained too in the Name of Jesus. The essay included in the second of these books is the sixth chapter of Bulgakov's 'The Philosophy of the Name'. It was written in the 1920s, commissioned by the All-Russian Council of 1917-1918 as a response to the controversy which sprang up on Mount Athos in the decade before 1914, when the doctrine that the Name of God is God, and so can be worshipped, became popular among Russian monks on the Holy Mountain. It was declared heretical by the Holy Synod in St Petersburg, and more than six hundred monks were forcibly repatriated from Athos to Russia. Bulgakov was one of the theologians who defended the 'imyaslavtsy', the 'worshippers of the Name'. The chapter included here provides a theological justification for the belief, with extensive references to the Name of God in the Old Testament and also to the New Testament Name of God, Jesus. Readers may be surprised to learn that 'Jesus' is not only the Name of the Second Person of the Trinity but, because of the interrelationship of the Three Persons, it is also the Name of the triune God. God is present in his Name, and so the Name, like the icon and like relics, radiates the divine energies, which, as Gregory Palamas argued in the fourteenth century, are consubstantial with God's essence and inseparable from it.

Running through all four essays is Bulgakov's insistence on the unity of the human and divine natures in the one person of Jesus Christ and the consequent deification of human nature, and on the penetration of the material creation too by the divine energies. Coming occasionally to the surface is his controversial doctrine of divine Sophia; and the second of these books concludes with Bulgakov's 'Post Scriptum' to 'The Name of God', entitled 'A Sophiological Interpretation of the Dogma of the Name of Jesus'. Boris Jakim is to be congratulated on making available to English-speaking readers these four essays, which illuminate specific aspects of Orthodox theology and provide further

insights into the thought of the most creative of twentieth century Russian Orthodox theologians.

This review previously appeared in THE CHURCH TIMES on 17th August 2012.

WILLIAM TAYLOR

The Young Turk's Crimes Against Humanity: The Armenian Genocide and Ethnic Cleansing in the Ottoman Empire. Taner Akçam. £26.55 hardback. Princeton University Press 2012. ISBN: 978-0-691-15333-9.

TANER AKÇAM is a prophetic voice amongst Turkish historians, a growing number of whom (especially younger ones) are no longer afraid to confront the historical realities of the late Ottoman treatment of its minorities, especially the Armenians. Akçam has a long and distinguished record of bringing Ottoman documents to light which reveal the depth of the horrors of the Armenian massacres of 1895-1915. The expulsion of Armenians in 1915 especially is seen as a "crime against humanity and civilization", and it is this contention which Akçam furthers with new archival material detailing this brutal history in detail.

In eleven chapters Taner Akçam takes the reader through the Ottoman sources, the transformation of the demography of the Ottoman Empire in the last two decades of the nineteenth century, leading to the Turkification of official policy through the ideologue Ziya Gökalp. Forced conversion to Islam and forced marriage of Christian children is an important new area of research, which Akçam deals with in depth, as well as the confiscation of Armenian property. More reflection on the consequences for all societies of the adoption of Gökalp's theories of the pure race characterising a state would have been instructive. The later twentieth century Nazi adoption of theories of racial purity owed much to Gökalp, and led to the infamous remark "Who now remembers the Armenians?", which Hitler is supposed to have said, a week be-

fore the German invasion of Poland in 1939. An exploration of Gökalp's own Kurdish roots in Diyarbakir/Omid would have been enlightening, but probably a step too far for Akçam at this stage.

Denial of all these phenomena has been the usual response of Turkish academics from the Ottoman period until now, one which continues to be the official Turkish policy. However, Turkish historiography is changing and some of these former Orthodoxies are now being challenged. Challenge the official Turkish narrative he does in his conclusion that "a moral admission must be made: recognition that a wrongful act took place, one so large and serious as to be deserving of moral opprobrium." The situation is changing in Turkey, and voices such as Akçam's are beginning to be heard. In this context, and dealing with the tragic and shameful history of the Armenian massacres, Akçam concludes that "the future looks a little more optimistic." Taner Akçam's important new work shows there is still a long way to go on this long and difficult road.

The Martyred Church: A History of the Church of the East. David Wilmshurst. £33.15 hardback. East & West, London, 2011. ISBN: 978-1-907318-04-7.

David Wilmshurst's book is a masterly sweep of the history of the Church of the East. He has lived much of his life in Hong Kong, is fluent in Syriac, Arabic and Chinese, and works as the academic editor at the Chinese University of Hong Kong. As such he is uniquely placed to be in the vanguard of the important new genre of academic studies in the area of Syriac transmission of faith and knowledge through the different languages of the Silk Road through Central Asia to the Far East. This area of studies is still in its infancy and has much more to reveal, which will deepen our knowledge of this important and neglected part of the Christian story.

The book is structured through ten historical chapters covering the first five centuries (Chapter 1), the fifth and sixth centuries with a detailed analysis of the schism over the Councils of Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451) in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 deals with the advent of Islam

until the mid eighth century leading into Chapter 4 on the Abbasid Caliphate, with particular emphasis on the Patriarchate of Timothy I (780-823). Chapter 5 takes the reader through the vicissitudes of the Mongol invasions up to the mid thirteenth century leading into the Mongol Century (1222-1317) as Chapter 6. The threats to the Church's existence from the internal schisms of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the threats from without from the Roman Catholic Church and from other Western Churches in the nineteenth century are portrayed in Chapters 7, 8, and 9, bringing the reader to the culmination of the martyred story in Chapter 10, "The Calamitous Twentieth Century."

Despite its tragic history, especially in the twentieth century, Wilmshurst points to new hope in his afterword "the Church of the East has begun to reverse the relentless process of attrition that began shortly after the Arab conquest." On the other hand, it is now primarily a Diaspora Church with its numbers rapidly dwindling in its historic homelands. Most interestingly of all, Wilmshurst prophetically claims that the cause of Assyrian nationalism has damaged the Church of the East, and it should distance itself from the phenomenon. Sections of the Church of the East from the late nineteenth century espoused European notions of the nation state, in their case linked to the history of Assyria. He states uncompromisingly, "The Assyrian identity is false." Most encouragingly of all, he predicts a resurgence of the Church of the East as a universal Church with a strong presence in China in the twenty first century, "which will be kinder than the twentieth." Those who admire and respect the history of this martyred Syriac-using Church of the East must surely share this sentiment.

THE ANGLICAN & EASTERN CHURCHES ASSOCIATION

in conjunction with

THE FELLOWSHIP OF ST ALBAN & ST SERGIUS

The Conflict of Syria and its effect on the Christian Community

Tuesday 5th February 2013

DR MIKAEL OZ

Syrian Orthodox Christian and AECA committee member

St James' Church, Sussex Gardens, London W2 3UD

*6.30 pm – Anglican Eucharist
7.15 pm – Lecture*

Coffee, tea and wine will be available before the lecture

Pilgrimage Secretary

The Revd Andrei Petrine

The Rectory

52 Epping Road

Toot Hill

Ongar

Essex CM5 9SQ

Tel: 01992 524 421

email: a.petrine@mac.com fds

Editor of Koinonia

The Revd Stephen Stavrou

33 Quick Road

London W4 2BU

Tel: 020 8707 2078

email: stephenfrancisstavrou@yahoo.co.uk

*The views expressed in Koinonia do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editor
or of the Committee of the Association.*

www.aeca.org.uk